UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

МЛ

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,627	09/25/2003	Michael K. Martyn	200309767-1	8079

22879   7590   07/10/2007
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
THERIAULT, STEVEN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/672,627	MARTYN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven B. Theriault	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 May 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-14 and 16-29</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4, 6-14, 16-29</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the following communications: RCE filed 05/02/2007.

2.   Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-29 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, 18, 23, and 25 are the

independent claims. Claims 1, 12, 18, 23, and 25 are the amended claims. The applicant is

advised that a new examiner has been assigned to the case.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR

1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for

continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been

timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR

1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/02/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness**

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Yasue et al (hereinafter Yasue) U.S. Patent No. 6289345 issued Sept. 11, 2001, in view of

Jungreis et al. (hereinafter Jungreis) U.S. Publication No. 20050209831 published Sept. 22,

2005 with a 102(e) date of Nov. 15, 2000, in further view of Leblang et al. (hereinafter

Leblang) U.S. Patent 5,574,898 issued Nov. 12, 1996.

In regard to **Independent claims 1 and 12,** Yasue teaches a method and a device for displaying

metadata placed on a document, comprising:

- Accepting a command to load a document file that corresponds to the document into a memory of a computing device, wherein the document contains drawings and metadata elements and wherein the metadata elements comprise at least one of a person's name, a revision identifier, and a document title, but do not include the drawings or dimensions (Yasue column 4, lines 15-20 and figure 8 and column 7, lines 30-50). Yasue teaches a process of accepting a file in memory from a workstation. The document contains metadata that is retrieved from the meta-database and the document metadata does not contain a drawing, as the model data is stored in a different location. The metadata has a revision number and a title (See column 5, lines 57-65 and figure 1).

- A computer-aided design application accepting, by way of an interface a command to assign a label to each of a plurality of metadata elements in the document file (See figure 6a and 6b) Yasue shows the application assigning a label to the metadata elements (See also figure 4). Yasue teaches that each component and component number is stored as metadata and the attributes of the component have an object number, software name, design date, designer, etc that all can be considered labels on the metadata elements.

- Displaying at least one of the plurality of metadata elements in response to a command to display the label assigned to the at least one of the plurality of metadata elements, thereby allowing a user to verify a value of the at least one of the plurality of metadata elements wherein only metadata elements that are located in predefined locations of the document file are displayed (Yasue Figure 3b) Yasue shows metadata displayed in a specific location where the metadata elements and the values are displayed (See also column 5, lines 47-65).

- Yasue describes a batch process to export metadata and model data from the server regarding a specific component. The export can occur when the user is looking for a

specific component or object but Yasue does not expressly teach updating incorrect

metadata values via batch.

Yasue does not expressly teach:

- Determining that at least a portion of one of the plurality of metadata elements is

   incorrect

However, Jungreis teaches a process of tracking and controlling changes to metadata

elements where a change in one element will cause a corresponding update to other

metadata elements that are related and required to be updated (See Page 2, Para 0016

and 0021, 0027 and 0031). Jungreis and Yasue both maintain metadata from a CAD

application and provide a process of letting a user make changes to the data. Jungreis

suggests a delayed processing of model changes until a process can make the changes

(See Para 0031), which could be a batch process. However, Yasue in view of Jungreis

do not expressly teach a command line interface or an automatic bulk correcting process

during batch.

Yasue in view of Jungreis does not expressly teach:

- A command line interface

- Automatically bulk correcting only the incorrect metadata elements located in the

   predefined locations by globally repeating the corrections in multiple locations of the

   document at one time with a batch process.

Leblang teaches the missing limitations of a command line interface (see figure 8 and column

18, lines 29-43). Leblang also teaches a batch process (See column 17, lines 60-67) that

automatically process changes to versions of elements that have specific version label

throughout the entire project (See column 18, lines 14-67 and column 19, lines 37-67 and

column 21, lines 43-67 and figures 20-24). Leblang, Yasue, and Jungreis are analogous art

because they all teach a process of managing metadata in a CAD application. They also all

teach a process of tracking items with labels.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention, having the teachings of Yasue, Jungreis and Leblang in front of them, to modify

the system of Yasue to incorporate the propagated changes to related metadata elements to

keep the model in sync and to incorporate the batch process of Leblang to update specific

elements of the metadata at a specific time. The motivation to combine Yasue, Jungreis, and

Leblang comes from the suggestion in Jungreis that it is necessary to track metadata

changes to elements and then propagate the changes to a large group of elements to update

all of the views in the 3d CAD model. Further, Leblang teaches a process of managing

version changes to data elements for any type of document, Unix file, programs, libraries,

structured databases, documentation files, and desktop publishing documents (See column

20, lines 29-41).

With respect to **dependent claims 2 - 4,** as indicated in the above discussion Yasue in view

of Jungreis in further view of Leblang teach each element of claim 1.

Yasue in view of Jungreis do not expressly teach the method additionally comprising the step

of accepting a command to correct the value of the at least one of the plurality of metadata

elements where the command to correct is generated by the user or the device. However,

this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention, in view of Leblang, because Leblang teaches a process that the system can

perform the updates automatically or can originate from the user (See column 20, lines 15-20

and column 22, lines 65-67 and column 23, lines 1-12 and figure 12 and column 23, lines 40-

67).

With respect to **dependent claim 6,** Yasue teaches a method wherein the labels assigned to each of the plurality of metadata elements correspond to the value of the plurality of metadata elements (See figure 3b). Yasue shows the labels and values represented as metadata.

With respect to **dependent claims 7 and 14,** Yasue teaches a method wherein the document is a drawing that describes an article of manufacture corresponding to a mechanical part (See Figure 3a and column 5, lines 49-55).

With respect to **dependent claim 8,** Yasue teaches a method wherein the document is a drawing that describes an article of manufacture corresponding to one of an electrical device or a system that performs a computer function (See column 6, lines 20-25).

With respect to **dependent claim 9,** as indicated in the above discussion Yasue in view of Jungreis in further view of Leblang teach each element of claim 1.

Yasue does not expressly teach wherein the displaying step further comprises displaying incorrect portions of the at least one of the plurality metadata elements in a manner that is discernable from correct portions of the at least one of the plurality of metadata elements. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Jungreis, because Jungreis teaches a process of indicating on the display when the items that correspond to a model change need to be changed. Providing and indication is a process of displaying elements in a manner that is discernable (See Para 0022, 0027, 0047, see symbols).

With respect to **dependent claim 10,** Yasue teaches a method wherein the document is generated by the computer-aided design application (See column 4, lines 5-10).

With respect to **dependent claim 11,** Yasue teaches a method wherein the plurality of metadata elements is placed within tables on the document (See figure 3b and column 5, lines 10-15).

With respect to **dependent claim 13,** claim 13 reflects substantially similar subject matter as claim 1 and thus is rejected along a similar rationale.

With respect to **dependent claim 16,** as indicated in the above discussion Yasue in view of Jungreis in further view of Leblang teach each element of claim 12.

Yasue does not expressly teach wherein the processor performs a correction to the at least some of the values of the plurality of metadata elements in response to a user specifying a correction to one of the values of the plurality of metadata elements. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Jungreis, because Jungreis teaches a process of updating any number of elements after a user has made changes to one element (See 0019, 0037, 0038, 0048).

With respect to **dependent claim 17,** Yasue teaches a method wherein the document includes a plurality of pages that specifies an article of manufacture, and wherein the display displays the values of metadata elements on one of the plurality of pages in response to the processor receiving a corresponding command (See figure 3b). Yasue shows the labels and values represented as metadata.

In regard to **Claims 18-22,** claims 18-22 reflect the substantially similar subject matter as claims 12, 13, 9 respectively, and in further view of the following are rejected along the same rationale. Yasue teaches the limitation of displaying certain metadata with certain string label (See figure 6a

and 9b) where the system finds the attribute information for a given object and the attributes

contain characters strings such as design date, designer etc.

In regard to **Claims 23- 24,** claims 23-24 reflect the substantially similar subject matter as claims

12 and 16, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to **Claims 25- 29,** claims 25-29 reflect the substantially similar subject matter as claims

18 -20, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

**It is noted that any citation to specific pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art
references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any
way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have
reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re *Heck,* 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-
33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re *Lemelson,* 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275,
277 (CCPA 1968)).**

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-29 have been considered but are moot in view

of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can

normally be reached on M, W, F 10:00AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SBT

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER